

Remarks

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are pending.

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 have been allowed.

Claims 11-18 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Leong (5,996,010). Claims 19-20 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Leong in view of Sorens (6317848).

The remarks supporting the rejection of Claims 11-16 are identical to those made in the prior action. The Office apparently did not consider the following distinguishing elements noted by the Applicant in response to the prior office action.

Claim 11 recites a peripheral device in an intranet communicating a **configuration** request to a web site hosted by a server *that is not in the intranet*. The Office cites to column 6, lines 23-34 in Leong as teaching these limitations in Claim 11. There is nothing in the passage in Leong relied on by the Office that teaches or suggests anything about a configuration request. In fact, there is nothing anywhere in Leong that teaches or suggests communicating a configuration request. So far as Applicant can determine, the term "configuration" does not appear in Leong.

There is also nothing in the passage in Leong relied on by the Office that teaches or suggests a peripheral device in an intranet communicating any kind of request to a server that is not in the intranet. On the contrary, web enabled agent 30 in Leong is in the intranet with the requesting peripheral device client 39/40. Leong, Fig. 2; column 6, lines 23-34 and column 12, lines 21-30.

Leong just doesn't support the Office's assertions. If the Office disagrees, it is respectfully requested to explain specifically how the cited passages in Leong teach or suggest a peripheral device in an intranet communicating a configuration request to a server that is not in the intranet. Absent such a showing, the rejection of Claim 11 should be withdrawn. The rejection of Claim 16 should be withdrawn for the same reasons.

Claims 12-15 distinguish patentably over Leong due to their dependence on Claim 11.

Further with regard to Claim 12, Leong does not teach or suggest a web site that provides a printer management service or a printer configuration. The passages in Leong cited by the Office in support of the rejection of Claim 12 don't say anything about a printer management service or a printer configuration.

Claim 17 recites a peripheral device pre-configured to communicate a request to the web site upon being booted up in an intranet that is protected by a firewall and, in response to receiving the request, the web site is configured to communicate the default device configuration to the peripheral device *through the firewall*. The web site is *not* hosted by a server that is *part of the intranet*. The Office cites to column 3, lines 48-65; column 4, lines 19-23; and column 6, lines 23-32 in Leong as teaching these limitations in Claim 17:

There is nothing in these passages in Leong relied on by the Office that teaches or suggests a peripheral device (or any other device) in an intranet communicating any kind of request to a server that is not in the intranet. On the contrary, web enabled agent 30 in Leong is in the intranet with the requesting peripheral device client 39/40. Leong, Fig. 2; column 6, lines 23-34 and column 12, lines 21-30.

There is also nothing in these passages in Leong that teaches or suggests a web site communicating a configuration to the device through the intranet firewall. In fact, there is nothing anywhere in Leong that teaches or suggests communicating through a firewall. So far as Applicant can determine, the term "firewall" or "fire wall" does not appear in Leong. Indeed, a firewall between the device and the web site is not needed in Leong because the device and the web site are both on the intranet.

If the Office disagrees with Applicant's analysis of Leong, it is respectfully requested to explain specifically how the cited passages in Leong teach or suggest a web site hosted by a server not on the intranet communicating the default configuration to the device through the intranet firewall. Absent such a showing, the rejection of Claim 17 should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Janine Helms

By 

Steven R. Ormiston

Reg. No. 35,974

208.433.1991 x204

September 22, 2005